

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Assessing the Impact of Dental Malocclusion on the Body's Postural Balance: Correlation between Angle Class, Pelvic Balance, and Center of Foot Pressure

Imad Akensous¹*, Samia Karkouri², Chaimae Iziki², Wiam Rerhrhaye³, Anissa
Abdelkoui⁴

1 Research Laboratory of Oral Biology and Biotechnology, Faculty of Dental Medicine,
Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco.

2 Department of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine, Hospital University Center, Faculty of
Medicine and Pharmacy, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco.

3 Department of Orthodontics, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Mohammed V University, Rabat,
Morocco.

4 Department of Removable Prosthodontics, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Mohammed V
University, Rabat, Morocco.

* Corresponding author
E-mail: imad.akensous@um5r.ac.ma

☞ These authors contributed equally to this work.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background**

29 The purpose of this study was to determine the association between pelvic and center foot
30 pressure (CoP) imbalances and angle class II or III malocclusions.

31 **Methods**

32 Our study is a prospective, descriptive, and analytic study conducted on two groups: a test
33 group of 53 patients who present malocclusion class II or III compared with 53 controls
34 matched for age and gender. The evaluation of the center of foot pressure (CoP) and the
35 confidence ellipse area (mm²) were performed by stabilometric platform using bipodal test
36 in two occlusal conditions, in maximum intercuspation (MI) and with a cotton roll (CR), with
37 and without visual cue. A pelvic level device was used to perform the pelvic balance
38 examination. Statistical analysis used the chi-square test, the McNemar test, and the Pearson
39 test.

40 **Results**

41 In the case group , the bipodal test was poor (outside reference values) in MI open eyes, MI
42 closed eyes, CR open eyes, and CR closed eyes in 47.2%, 62.3%, 58.5%, and 64.2%,
43 respectively, vs 54.7%, 43.4%, 34.0%, and 67.9%, respectively, of controls ($p < 0.05$). None
44 subjects in the control group were diagnosed with pelvic imbalance, against five patients
45 (9.4%) in the case group ($p < 0.05$). Pelvic imbalance was noted in two patients in class II and
46 only one patient in class III. For Class II, the bipodal test results were poor in MI open eyes,
47 MI closed eyes, CR open eyes, and CR closed eyes conditions with percentages of 54.2%,

48 66.7%, 70.8%, and 58.3%, respectively ($p < 0.05$). In Class III, results were generally good in
49 MI open eyes (80%), but mostly poor in MIP and CR closed eyes (90%).

50 **Conclusion**

51 There was a significant difference in pelvic imbalance between the case group and the control
52 group. Angle Classes II and III had no significant correlation with pelvic tilt. The
53 stabilometric examinations have shown that Angle class II influences the CoP displacement
54 and the confidence ellipse area in MI open eyes conditions. This finding supports the
55 hypothesis that dental malocclusion can have an effect on the postural system.

56 **Introduction**

57 An ocular motor problem, a hearing loss, or an unstable podal support systematically
58 influences postural balance; on the other hand, a problem with the manducatory apparatus,
59 such as a dental malocclusion, could have an impact on postural stability. In fact, if the podal
60 sensor, the visual system, and the vestibular system are classically considered as postural
61 sensors that participate in one way or another in postural control, the manducatory apparatus
62 is not yet classified as a postural sensor.

63 In recent years, many studies have focused on the potential correlations between the
64 stomatognathic system and body posture. Several biomechanical and neurophysiological
65 hypotheses have attempted to explain this correlation, such as muscle chain, trigeminal nerve
66 activation or inhibition, sterno-cleido-mastoidian muscle contraction, and facial chain theory
67 [1] [2] [3] . A study by Amaricai E (2020) showed that there are some differences between
68 different mandibular positions in subjects with physiological occlusion; a maximum mouth
69 opening (no dental contact) deteriorates the static balance, whereas the postural stability
70 improved in maximum intercuspitation compared to the mandibular postural position [4].

71 Sakaguchi in 2007 studied the effect of different mandibular positions on postural stability
72 and found that the body is more stable when the subject is in centered occlusion than when the
73 mandible is in resting or eccentric position (smaller center of pressure). This change in
74 mandibular posture affects the cervical and facial muscles via the trigeminal nerve [5]. Using
75 a stabilometric table, Tardieu et al. concluded that posture is only affected by occlusal
76 dysfunction in the dynamic state (when the patient starts to move or walk) and not in the static
77 state [6]. Several authors will reach the same conclusion as Sakaguchi and Tardieu. Like
78 them, Wakano in 2011, and Tingey in 2003, studied the effects of voluntary lateral deviation
79 of the mandible on postural balance and deduced that changes in the stomatognathic system
80 significantly affect postural balance [7] [8]. Hanke, in his systematic review of 355 articles,
81 concluded that there is a clear clinical link between dental occlusion and posture, but a causal
82 link is still difficult to prove [9]. Amat in 2009 and Gasq in 2010 did comparable work and
83 reached a similar conclusion [10] [11].

84 In contrast to previous findings, Ferrario reached completely different results and concluded
85 that the foot pressure center is not affected by any of the mandibular positions [12]. In three of
86 his studies, Perinetti attempted to determine the relationship between occlusion and posture
87 using posturography [13] [14] [15]. There is a significant difference in displacement of the
88 pressure center between closed eyes and open eyes conditions, but no significant difference
89 between the two positions of the mandible (rest position and maximum intercuspid position)
90 has been detected. The author concludes that posturography is currently unable to detect this
91 correlation.

92 In 2006, Michelotti demonstrated that only changing the position of the temporomandibular
93 joint affects postural balance, but not dental occlusion [16]. According to März (2017) it is not
94 possible to show a relationship between occlusion and posture, since the body compensates
95 immediately at the neuromuscular level after the change of mandibular position to adapt and

96 find a new balance [17]. A recent systematic review of major databases showed that 66.7% of
97 articles showed an association between dental occlusion and body posture, and 33.3% found
98 no relationship [18]. However , the majority of articles published are based on protocols study
99 of low methodological value that are generally done on small groups of subjects without a
100 control group and carried out on healthy subjects not suffering from any dental malocclusion
101 [19].

102 The impact of occlusal problems on postural control remains controversial, as most of the
103 information available to date is inconclusive and recent reviews have reported contrasting
104 results. In this heated debate, among the scientific communities, it is difficult to reach to a
105 unanimous conclusion.

106 The purpose of our study was to demonstrate, through a case-control study the existence of a
107 statistically significant association between Angle class malocclusions and pelvic imbalance,
108 Angle class malocclusions and center of foot pressure displacement depending on two dental
109 and visual conditions.

110 To our knowledge, no clinical case-control study has been conducted to investigate the
111 probable correlation between dental malocclusion and postural imbalance on a national and
112 continental scale.

113

114 **Material and methods**

115 **Subjects**

116 This prospective descriptive-analytical case-control study was conducted among 106
117 individuals divided into two equal groups of 53 patients. The sample of cases with

118 malocclusion was recruited from the dental consultation and treatment center at the
119 department of Dentofacial Orthopedic, while the 53 healthy subjects were recruited from
120 students of Faculty of Dentistry, their relatives, and acquaintances.

121 We calculated the sample size formula using "riskcalc-simple size calculator" software [20].
122 A sample of subjects with malocclusion will be compared for postural balance with a sample
123 of controls. Assuming an equal number of cases and controls (i.e., $k = 1$). For achieving an
124 80% power (i.e., $1 - \beta = 0.8$) at the 5% level of significance (i.e., $\alpha = 0.05$) and for $p_0 = 0.66$,
125 the sample size is 46 cases and 46 controls or 53 cases and 53 controls by incorporating the
126 continuity correction [21] [22] [32].

127 All subjects who participated in this study underwent their medical history examined by
128 means of a questionnaire, followed by an intraoral and extraoral examination to detect any
129 possible oral pathology except dental malocclusion. This study included patients aged from 14
130 to 55 years, of both sexes. The selecting criteria for the test group were: good general health
131 according to anamnesis and through clinical examination; complete dentition and Angle class
132 II or III. On the other hand, the control group had any dental malocclusion traits but with a
133 bilateral Angle class I of molars and canines. The exclusion criteria were: an age below 14
134 years and above 55 years; partially or completely toothless; temporomandibular dysfunction
135 (TMD) or any other disorder affecting the mandibular apparatus ; vestibular or sensory
136 disease; ongoing orthodontic treatment; prior or ongoing orthopedic treatment; acute or
137 chronic orofacial or vertebral inflammatory diseases and subjects who performed an
138 orthognathic surgery.

139 All patients were referred to the Dentofacial Orthopedic service, then to the Physical
140 Medicine and Rehabilitation department during the period ranging from 10 October 2022 to
141 21 May 2023. The experimental protocol complies with the Declaration of Helsinki on ethical

142 principles for research involving human subjects and it was approved by the local Ethics
143 Committee (59/2022). A written informed consent form was obtained from each patient or
144 their legal guardian before the tests.

145 **Methods**

146 **Angle class assessment**

147 The examination of the right and left canine and molar dental angle class was performed by
148 an experienced orthodontist directly on the oral cavity; then recorded on a database. Examiner
149 reliability was confirmed by repeated intra-examiner examinations for 50 subjects. The intra-
150 examiner ICC was about 0, 8.

151 Angle Class I, II or III are evaluated based on the positioning of the first molar and canine
152 between the two arches. If the maxillary canine is opposite the embrasure between the
153 mandibular canine and the lower 1st premolar, and the mesiobuccal cusp of the maxillary 1st
154 molar is aligned with the center (mesiobuccal groove) of the mandibular 1st molar, the patient
155 is classified as Angle Class I [23].

156 Class II malocclusion is characterized by a distal position of the mandibular arch from its
157 normal position, the mandibular first molar as well as the rest of the dentition is distanced
158 from its normal position in relation to the maxillary first molar [24]. Class III malocclusion is
159 characterized by distocclusion of the maxillary first molar from the mandibular first molar and
160 of the maxillary canine from the mandibular canine [25] .

161 **Postural balance assessment**

162 **Assessment of pelvic balance**

163 This examination is performed by a pelvic level device (Advanced Casting Technology TM,
164 Boise, USA), an easy tool to use by the clinician for a quick and accurate assessment of the
165 symmetry of the iliac crest. This device is composed of three expandable arms, in each one a
166 level bubble [26].

167 To perform the test, the patient is asked to stand up, then the expandable wings of the tool are
168 pressed on the pelvic bone crest, and by a simple observation of the bubbles, the pelvic
169 balance is evaluated. When the three bubbles are in the center of the three branches, the pelvis
170 is balanced; if not, it is deviated (S1 Fig).

171 **Posturographic assessment**

172 Postural stability is assessed by means of a sophisticated balance system (TecnoBody S.r.l.,
173 Prokin 252, Dalmine BG, Italy). This device consists of a stabilometric platform, a personal
174 computer, and a 20-inch touch screen display. For correct feet position, the platform is
175 marked with reference lines and is composed of three highly sensitive load cells and a trunk
176 sensor to accurately obtain information about the patient's balance during various tests. The
177 stabilometric data were sampled at 20 Hz [27] [28].

178 The system contains several tests; we have chosen the bipodal test, which is conducted in a
179 static situation and provides information about the displacement of the center of pressure
180 (CoP) and about the confidence ellipse area (mm²) from reference values in two visual
181 conditions (open eyes and closed eyes).

182 This test is recorded under two occlusal conditions: a first recording in MI and a second
183 recording with a cotton roll (CR) of 10 mm thickness placed between the two central incisors
184 of the two dental arches in order to eliminate the posterior periodontal receptors information
185 and keep only that of the central incisors.

186 The practitioner places the subject precisely on the platform according to the following
187 conditions: barefoot, a vertical position with the arms along the body without voluntary
188 movements, soles of feet must be attached to the platform, and the examination room must
189 remain calm throughout the test. If any of these conditions are not met, the test is canceled and
190 then repeated. The entire examination is conducted by the same experienced practitioner.

191 At the first recording, the subject is asked to keep the teeth in maximum intercuspal position
192 (MIP), to maintain a static standing position and to initially focus (eyes opened) on a "plus
193 sign" displayed on the device's screen before closing his eyes during the second part of the
194 test (S2 Fig).

195 The recording takes 60 seconds (30 seconds with open eyes and 30 seconds with closed eyes).
196 After a rest period of about 3 to 4 minutes (to avoid the effect of fatigue), a cotton roll is
197 placed between the central incisors of the two dental arches, the subject is placed back on the
198 platform exactly in the same way as the first recording, and then the data is recorded again for
199 the same duration. Finally, the cotton roll is removed, and the subject leaves the platform. The
200 measurements recorded in MIP and with a CR were taken consecutively in the same order.

201 The test results vary between three intervals represented by three colors: Green reflects that
202 the CoP is included in physiological range and the confidence ellipse area is inside high
203 quality reference values, yellow indicates a medium results but always in physiological range,
204 while the orange color means that the CoP is not physiological and the confidence ellipse area
205 is outside reference values.

206 **Statistical analysis**

207 In our study, the Angle class was analyzed with age, sex, and two postural parameters, which
208 are pelvic imbalance and the bipodal test in two visual conditions (open eyes and closed eyes)
209 and two occlusal conditions (MIP and CR).

210 Descriptive statistics included the mean and standard deviation for quantitative variables with
211 a normal distribution, the median and interquartile for Gaussian distribution, the frequency
212 and percentage for categorical variables. Comparisons between two groups, for categorical
213 variables, were performed by the χ^2 test if the theoretical number is ≥ 5 or by the *Fisher test* if
214 the observed number is <5 , with 95% confidence interval (CI) calculated where appropriate.
215 A comparison of a qualitative variable within the same group was performed by *McNemar*
216 *test*. Correlation analysis was performed by *Pearson Chi-2 test* to assess the independent
217 association of Angle class with the two posture variables. The p-value was bilateral and
218 considered statistically significant if it was less than 0.05. All analyses were performed using
219 SPSS, version 24.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL).

220 **Results**

221 This study was conducted on a sample of one hundred six patients: 57 males (53.77%) and 49
222 females (46.23%) aged between 14 and 55 years, median age 25 [21–36] years, divided into
223 two groups of equal size. Table 1 represents the description of different variables in the case
224 group.

225

226

227

228

229

Table 1. description of variables in the cases group (N = 53)

Parameters	N(53)
Age, years (IQR)	24 [17-37]
Sex (F)	28 (52.8%)
Angle Class	
I	19 (35.8%)
II	24 (45.3%)
III	10 (18.9%)
Pelvis balance	
No	5 (9.4%)
Bipodal test	
MI open eyes (poor)	25 (47.2%)
MI closed eyes (poor)	33 (62.3%)
CR open eyes (poor)	31 (58.5%)
CR closed eyes (poor)	34 (64.2%)

230 N: Number of subjects in case group; IQR: interquartile range; MI: maximum intercuspation;
 231 CR: Cotton roll.

232

233 This group was composed of 53 patients (28 females and 25 males, mean age 24 [17–37]
 234 years). Analysis of the dental occlusion noted was as follows: 35.8% Angle class I, 45.3%
 235 class II and 18.9% class III. Pelvic imbalance was observed in 9.4% of subjects. The bipodal
 236 test was poor in MI open eyes, MI closed eyes, CR open eyes, and CR closed eyes for 47.2%,
 237 62.3%, 58.5%, and 64.2%, respectively.

238 Description of different variables in the control group is shown in Table 2, which also
 239 consisted of 53 patients, (25 females and 28 males, mean age 26 [22–38] years). All subjects
 240 in this group belonged to Angle class I. No pelvic imbalance was noted. The bipodal test
 241 results were poor in the MI open eyes, MI closed eyes, CR open eyes, and CR closed eyes
 242 conditions for 54.7%, 43.4%, 34.0%, and 67.9% of subjects, respectively.

243

244

245

246

247

Table 2. description of variables in the control group (N = 53)

Parameters		N(53)
Age, years (IQR)		26 [22-38]
Sex (M)		28 (52.8%)
Angle Class		
	Class I	53 (100%)
Pelvis balance		
	No	0 (0.00%)
Bipodal test		
	MI open eyes (poor)	29 (54.7%)
	MI closed eyes (poor)	23 (43.4%)
	CR open eyes (poor)	18 (34.0%)
	CR closed eyes (poor)	36 (67.9%)

248

N: Number of subjects in control group; IQR: interquartile range; MI: maximum intercuspatation; CR: Cotton roll.

249

250

251

The comparison of pelvic imbalance between the case and control groups is shown in Table 3.

252

Table 3. Comparison of pelvic imbalance between the case and control group.

		Case group		Control group		Total		χ^2 test
		Effective	Percentage %	Effective	Percentage %	Effective	Percentage %	
Pelvic balance	Yes	48	90.9	53	100	101	95.4	0.022*
	No	5	9.4	0	0.00	5	4.6	

253

χ^2 test: Chi-squared test ;*: p-value significant if < 0.05.

254

255

No subjects in the control group were diagnosed with pelvic imbalance, against five patients

256

(9.4%) in the case group.

257

The results of the bipodal test (CoP assessment) in visual and occlusal conditions between the

258

two groups are represented in Table 4.

259

260

261

262 **Table 4. Comparison of the Bipodal test between the two occlusal and visual conditions.**

			MIP		CR		Mc-Nemar Test
			Open eyes	Closed eyes	Open eyes	Closed eyes	
Bipodal Test	Case group	Ex	7 (13.2%)	15 (28.3%)	6 (11.3%)	16 (30.2%)	NS
		G	21 (29.6%)	5 (9.4%)	16 (30.2%)	3 (5.6%)	
		P	25 (47.2%)	33 (62.3%)	31 (58.5%)	34 (64.2%)	
	Control group	Ex	14 (26.4%)	30 (56.6%)	14 (26.4%)	14 (26.4%)	0.01*<0.05
		G	10 (18.9%)	0(0.00%)	21 (39.6%)	3 (5.7%)	
		P	29 (54.7%)	23 (43.4%)	18 (34.0%)	36 (67.9%)	

263 Ex : Excellent ; G : Good ; P : Poor ; NS : difference not statistically significant ; MIP :
264 maximum intercuspation position ; CR : Cotton roll ; *: p-value significant if< 0.05

265

266 The bipodal test results in the case group in MIP open eyes were physiological for 28 patients,
267 i.e., 52.8%, compared to 41.5% in CR open eyes. In MIP closed eyes, 20 patients (37.7%) had
268 normal results compared to 19 patients (35.8%) in CR closed eyes. In the control group,
269 45.3% of subjects performed good or excellently on the bipodal test in MIP open eyes,
270 compared to 66% in CR open eyes conditions. In MIP closed eyes, 56.6% had physiological
271 results vs 32.1% in CR closed eyes.

272 In the bipodal test, 26.4% of the control subjects had excellent results in MIP open eyes,
273 against only 13.2% of subjects in the case group, whereas in MIP closed eyes, 28.3% of the
274 cases had an excellent result against 56.6% of the controls. In CR open eyes conditions,
275 58.5% of patients with dental malocclusion (class II or III) had poor results vs 34% of the
276 control group (class I), while with closed eyes, the results were relatively similar between the
277 two groups.

278 Table 5 shows the correlation between Angle Class II and III, the bipodal test in two occlusal
279 conditions, and the pelvic imbalance.

280

281 **Table 5: Correlation between Angle class, bipodal test , and pelvic imbalance.**

		Bipodal test				Pelvic balance	
		ICP		CR		No	Yes
		Open eyes	Closed eyes	Open eyes	Closed eyes		
Class II	Ex	8.30%	20.80%	4.20%	33.30%	2 (8.3%)	22(91.7%)
	G	37.50%	12.50%	25.00%	8.30%		
	P	54.20%	66.70%	70.80%	58.30%		
Class III	Ex	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	10.00%	1 (10%)	9(90%)
	G	80.00%	20.00%	50.00%	10.00%		
	P	20.00%	70.00%	50.00%	80.00%		
Pearson correlation test		0.018* (Classe II)	0.10	0.068	0.41	0.11	

282 Ex : Excellent ; G : Good ; P : Poor ; ICP : intercuspatal position ; CR : Cotton roll ; *: p-value
 283 significant if < 0.05.

284 Pelvic imbalance was diagnosed in two patients with class II and only one patient with class
 285 III. For Class II, the bipodal test results were poor in MIP open eyes, MIP closed eyes, CR
 286 open eyes, and CR closed eyes conditions with percentages of 54.2%, 66.7%, 70.8%, and
 287 58.3%, respectively. Class III had generally a good result in MIP open eyes (80%), but mostly
 288 poor in MIP and CR closed eyes (90%).

289 Discussion

290 The aim of this study was to investigate the supposed correlation between dental
 291 malocclusion, especially class II and III malocclusion, with pelvic imbalance and CoP
 292 displacement. A clinical examination of the pelvic girdle, as well as objective posturographic
 293 tests under different occlusal and visual conditions was performed, for the case group (dental
 294 malocclusion) and the control group (normocclusion).

295 In this study, we reported a significant difference between the case group and the control
 296 group regarding to pelvic imbalance. It was significantly higher in subjects with malocclusion
 297 compared to controls. These findings suggest that Angle Class II or III may be related with
 298 pelvic imbalance. A correlation analysis by pearson's chi-2 test was performed to determine

299 the association between Angle class malocclusions and pelvic tilt. This analysis showed that
300 there was no significant correlation between class II or III and pelvic imbalance. A previous
301 study conducted by Lippold in 2006, consisted of 53 healthy subjects (32 women, 21 men;
302 mean age 24.6 years), six angular measurements of the skeleton by lateral head cephalography
303 and an examination of the sagittal profile of the back by rasterography were performed, in
304 order to analyze the probable relationships between spinal posture (thoracic, lordotic, and
305 pelvic tilt) and the craniofacial morphology. They reported a statistically significant
306 correlation between craniofacial parameters and a low back profile. Normal back parameters
307 were higher in patients with a distal (Class II) and vertical mandible (upper thoracic, lumbar
308 lordosis, pelvic angle), and vice versa for patients with a mesial and horizontal mandible
309 (Class III) [29]. In 2007, the same author demonstrated a correlation between the facial axis
310 and facial depth of subjects with Class II and III malocclusion with pelvic torsion by
311 cephalometric and rastereographic analysis. Statistically significant differences in pelvic
312 torsion were reported in relation to facial axis and facial depth. Patients with a vertical facial
313 pattern and a distally positioned mandible have a slight pelvic torsion where the left iliac
314 spine faces backward relative to the right iliac spine. Patients with a horizontal facial pattern
315 and a mesially positioned mandible have a slight pelvic torsion where the right iliac spine
316 faces backward relative to the left iliac spine. Therefore, the author concluded that an
317 orthopedic examination can be considered for patients undergoing orthodontic treatment [30].

318 In the present study, we also performed a posturographic examination (the bipodal test) in two
319 occlusal conditions, in intercuspal position (ICP) and with cotton roll (CR), in order to
320 evaluate the oscillation of the CoP and the confidence ellipse area (mm²) with and without the
321 visual cue. In the case group, there was no significant difference between the two occlusal
322 conditions, suggesting that ICP or CR conditions did not affect either the CoP oscillation or
323 the confidence area.

324 In contrast, there was a significant difference between ICP and CR in the control group. More
325 subjects exhibited physiological results in the CR open eyes conditions compared to the ICP
326 open eyes conditions. These findings suggest that CR improved the bipodal test performance
327 of control subjects. However, the results were reversed in CR with closed eyes (visual sensor
328 deactivated), showing a highly significant difference towards a CoP and a confidence area
329 outside reference values. This suggests that the ocular sensor may have compensated for the
330 effect of CR when the eyes are open. These results can be confirmed more in the ICP with
331 closed eyes, where the significance is very high for a physiological oscillation of the CoP and
332 the confidence area. On the basis of these results, we can say that the oscillation interval of
333 the CoP and the confidence ellipse area improved in ICP closed eyes conditions (the best
334 results were obtained in ICP closed eyes), which suggests that the physiological dental
335 occlusion of controls compensated for the absence of the visual sensor, which defends the
336 hypothesis that the dental occlusion can be considered as a main postural sensor. März et al.,
337 in their pilot study published in 2017, asked the question: "Can different occlusal positions
338 instantaneously impact spine and body posture?" To answer this question, they selected 44
339 healthy volunteers and evaluated ten postural variables with four mandibular positions (right
340 eccentric, physiological rest, cotton rolls on both sides, and 1 mm occlusal elevation) using
341 rasterography. Significant differences were found for cervical spine, lumbar spine, and
342 kyphotic angle with these different mandibular positions. However, they could not
343 conclusively associate dental occlusion conditions to instantaneous body posture changes,
344 since the postural variations could also come from neuromuscular compensation [17].

345 In this research, a significant difference was reported between the two groups, in the bipodal
346 test, suggesting that there is a potential effect of dental malocclusion on the CoP and on the
347 confidence area. A correlation analysis between the bipodal test, Class II and III dental
348 malocclusion showed that Angle Class II significantly influences CoP and the confidence

349 ellipse area in ICP with open eyes conditions. According to Baldini et al, the force platform is
350 not able to detect clearly the relationship between dental occlusion and body posture. It has
351 been shown that vision influences body posture during stabilometric platform testing and not
352 mandibular positions [31]. Sakaguchi's study reported a significant difference between the
353 total length of the CoP path with different mandibular positions. The total CoP path length in
354 centric occlusion was shorter than in the resting position. The CoP area in right eccentric
355 mandibular position was larger than in centric occlusion. Based on these results, it was
356 concluded that mandibular positions affect body posture [5].

357 The lack of comparison of the exclusive effects of the eye sensor on posture in stabilometric
358 platform evaluation between the case and the control group is a limitation of our study.

359 Overall, it would be interesting to conduct an additional study that will include other types of
360 dental malocclusion with new postural parameters and to use posturographic tests in the static
361 as well as dynamic state to reveal other possible effects of dental malocclusion on the postural
362 system.

363 **Conclusion**

364 In our study, we demonstrated through clinical examinations that there is a significant
365 difference in pelvic imbalance between the case and the control group, but no significant
366 correlation was noted between Angle Class II or III and pelvic tilt. Through the stabilometric
367 examination (bipodal test), we demonstrated that Angle class II influences the CoP and the
368 confidence ellipse in the ICP open eyes conditions. The same test proved that the
369 normocclusion of control subjects improved or perfectly compensated the postural balance in
370 case of absence of the ocular sensor (eyes closed). All of this, supports the hypothesis that

371 dental malocclusion can have an effect on the postural system, as well as the postulate
372 considering dental occlusion as a postural sensor.

373 **References**

- 374 1. Berry R, Oakley P, Harrison D. Is one cause of trigeminal neuralgia subluxation of
375 craniocervical posture? 2020;3: 28–35.
- 376 2. Pinganaud G, Bourcier F, Buisseret-Delmas C, Buisseret P. Primary trigeminal afferents
377 to the vestibular nuclei in the rat: existence of a collateral projection to the vestibulo-
378 cerebellum. *Neurosci Lett*. 1999;264: 133–136. doi:10.1016/S0304-3940(99)00179-2
- 379 3. Kibana Y, Ishijima T, Hirai T. Occlusal support and head posture. *J Oral Rehabil*.
380 2002;29: 58–63. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2842.2002.00794.x
- 381 4. Amaricai E, Onofrei RR, Suciu O, Marcauteanu C, Stoica ET, Negruțiu ML, et al. Do
382 different dental conditions influence the static plantar pressure and stabilometry in young
383 adults? *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15: e0228816. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0228816
- 384 5. Sakaguchi K, Mehta NR, Abdallah EF, Forgione AG, Hirayama H, Kawasaki T, et al.
385 Examination of the Relationship Between Mandibular Position and Body Posture.
386 *CRANIO®*. 2014 [cited 11 Jun 2022]. doi:10.1179/crn.2007.037
- 387 6. Tardieu C, Dumitrescu M, Giraudeau A, Blanc J-L, Cheynet F, Borel L. Dental
388 occlusion and postural control in adults. *Neurosci Lett*. 2009;450: 221–224.
389 doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2008.12.005
- 390 7. Wakano S, Takeda T, Nakajima K, Kurokawa K, Ishigami K. Effect of experimental
391 horizontal mandibular deviation on dynamic balance. *J Prosthodont Res*. 2011;55: 228–
392 233. doi:10.1016/j.jpor.2011.03.001
- 393 8. Tingey EM, Buschang PH, Throckmorton GS. Mandibular rest position: a reliable
394 position influenced by head support and body posture. *Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop*
395 *Off Publ Am Assoc Orthod Its Const Soc Am Board Orthod*. 2001;120: 614–622.
396 doi:10.1067/mod.2001.119802
- 397 9. Hanke BA, Motschall E, Türp JC. Association between orthopedic and dental findings:
398 what level of evidence is available? *J Orofac Orthop Fortschritte Kieferorthopadie*
399 *OrganOfficial J Dtsch Ges Kieferorthopadie*. 2007;68: 91–107. doi:10.1007/s00056-007-
400 0634-0
- 401 10. Complexe odonto-gnathique et posture - PDF Téléchargement Gratuit. [cited 10 Jun
402 2022]. Available: [https://docplayer.fr/4371067-Complexe-odonto-gnathique-et-](https://docplayer.fr/4371067-Complexe-odonto-gnathique-et-posture.html)
403 [posture.html](https://docplayer.fr/4371067-Complexe-odonto-gnathique-et-posture.html)
- 404 11. Amat P. Occlusion, orthodontics and posture: are there evidences? The example of
405 scoliosis. *Int J Stomatol Occlusion Med*. 2009;2: 2–10. doi:10.1007/s12548-009-0001-4

- 406 12. Ferrario VF, Sforza C, Schmitz JH, Taroni A. Occlusion and center of foot pressure
407 variation: Is there a relationship? *J Prosthet Dent.* 1996;76: 302–308.
408 doi:10.1016/S0022-3913(96)90176-6
- 409 13. Perinetti G, Contardo L, Biasati A, Perdoni L, Castaldo A. Dental Malocclusion and
410 Body Posture in Young Subjects: A Multiple Regression Study. *Clin São Paulo Braz.*
411 2010;65: 689–95. doi:10.1590/S1807-59322010000700007
- 412 14. Perinetti G. Dental occlusion and body posture: no detectable correlation. *Gait Posture.*
413 2006;24: 165–168. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2005.07.012
- 414 15. Perinetti G. Temporomandibular disorders do not correlate with detectable alterations in
415 body posture. *J Contemp Dent Pract.* 2007;8: 60–67.
- 416 16. Michelotti A, Buonocore G, Farella M, Pellegrino G, Piergentili C, Altobelli S, et al.
417 Postural stability and unilateral posterior crossbite: is there a relationship? *Neurosci Lett.*
418 2006;392: 140–144. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2005.09.008
- 419 17. März K, Adler W, Matta R-E, Wolf L, Wichmann M, Bergauer B. Can different occlusal
420 positions instantaneously impact spine and body posture? : A pilot study using
421 rasterstereography for a three-dimensional evaluation. *J Orofac Orthop Fortschritte*
422 *Kieferorthopadie Organ Official J Dtsch Ges Kieferorthopadie.* 2017;78: 221–232.
423 doi:10.1007/s00056-016-0073-x
- 424 18. Álvarez Solano C, González Camacho LA, Castaño Duque SP, Cortés Velosa T, Vanoy
425 Martin JA, Chambrone L. To evaluate whether there is a relationship between occlusion
426 and body posture as delineated by a stabilometric platform: A systematic review. *Cranio*
427 *J Craniomandib Pract.* 2020; 1–12. doi:10.1080/08869634.2020.1857614
- 428 19. Nasr MK, Hamel MO, Diemer MF, Kemoun MP, Monsarrat MP. PRÉSIDENTE DU
429 COMITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE. 2019; 88.
- 430 20. Sample size calculator. [cited 5 Sep 2022]. Available: <https://riskcalc.org/samplesize/>
- 431 21. Vakili L, Halabchi F, Mansournia MA, Khami MR, Irandoost S, Alizadeh Z. Prevalence
432 of Common Postural Disorders Among Academic Dental Staff. *Asian J Sports Med.*
433 2016;7: e29631. doi:10.5812/asjism.29631
- 434 22. Cabrera-Domínguez ME, Domínguez-Reyes A, Pabón-Carrasco M, Pérez-Belloso AJ,
435 Coheña-Jiménez M, Galán-González AF. Dental Malocclusion and Its Relation to the
436 Podal System. *Front Pediatr.* 2021;9: 654229. doi:10.3389/fped.2021.654229
- 437 23. Perinetti G, Cordella C, Pellegrini F, Esposito P. The prevalence of malocclusal traits
438 and their correlations in mixed dentition children: results from the Italian OHSAR
439 Survey. *Oral Health Prev Dent.* 2008;6: 119–129.
- 440 24. Bishara SE. Class II Malocclusions: Diagnostic and Clinical Considerations With and
441 Without Treatment. *Semin Orthod.* 2006;12: 11–24. doi:10.1053/j.sodo.2005.10.005
- 442 25. Class III Malocclusion - an overview | ScienceDirect Topics. [cited 25 Jan 2023].
443 Available: [https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/class-iii-](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/class-iii-malocclusion)
444 [malocclusion](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/class-iii-malocclusion)

- 445 26. Orthotic Pelvic Level | Custom Orthotic Pelvic Level | Advanced Casting Technology.
446 In: Advanced Casting Technology | High Quality Foot Orthotics [Internet]. 18 May 2012
447 [cited 23 Jan 2023]. Available: [https://www.advcasting.com/lab-services/act-pelvic-](https://www.advcasting.com/lab-services/act-pelvic-level/)
448 [level/](https://www.advcasting.com/lab-services/act-pelvic-level/)
- 449 27. ProKin 252 | TecnoBody. [cited 21 Jun 2022]. Available:
450 <https://www.tecnobody.com/en/products/detail/prokin-252>
- 451 28. TecnoBody Balance System: Reddy Care Physical & Occupational Therapy: Physical
452 Therapists. [cited 21 Jun 2022]. Available: [https://www.reddycare.net/blog/tecnobody-](https://www.reddycare.net/blog/tecnobody-balance-system)
453 [balance-system](https://www.reddycare.net/blog/tecnobody-balance-system)
- 454 29. Lippold C, Danesh G, Schilgen M, Drerup B, Hackenberg L. Relationship between
455 Thoracic, Lordotic, and Pelvic Inclination and Craniofacial Morphology in Adults.
456 *Angle Orthod.* 2006;76: 779–785. doi:10.1043/0003-
457 3219(2006)076[0779:RBTLAP]2.0.CO;2
- 458 30. Lippold C, Danesh G, Hoppe G, Drerup B, Hackenberg L. Trunk Inclination, Pelvic Tilt
459 and Pelvic Rotation in Relation to the Craniofacial Morphology in Adults. *Angle*
460 *Orthod.* 2007;77: 29–35. doi:10.2319/121205-434R.1
- 461 31. Baldini A, Nota A, Tripodi D, Longoni S, Cozza P. Evaluation of the correlation
462 between dental occlusion and posture using a force platform. *Clinics.* 2013;68: 45–49.
463 doi:10.6061/clinics/2013(01)OA07
- 464 32. Fleiss, J.L., Levin, B. and Paik, M.C. (2003) *Statistical Methods for Rates and*
465 *Proportions.* 3rd Edition, Wiley, Hoboken. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471445428>

466

467 **Supporting information**

468

469 **S1 Fig. Examination of the pelvis balance (iliac crest) using a “pelvic level”**

470

471 **S2 Fig. Photo of a patient during posturographic examination (bipodal test)**